

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/582,003	12/02/2002	Rolf Larsson	C36465	6506
7.				15
Orum & Roth			EXAMINER	
53 West Jackson Boulevard Chicago, IL 60604-3606			STONER, KILEY SHAWN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1725	
•	. •		DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<del>\</del>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
77	09/582,003	LARSSON, ROLF
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit
	Kiley Stoner	1725
The MAILING DATE of this c mmur	nication appears on the cover sheet w	ith the c rrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3)  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum is - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply - Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r munication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirl atutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON y will, by statute, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed  ty (30) days will be considered timely.  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) fi	iled on 02 December 2002 .	
	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.	•
3)☐ Since this application is in condition	n for allowance except for formal mat ctice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	tters, prosecution as to the merits is D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
4) $\boxtimes$ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the	application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	are withdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 9</u> is/are rejected.		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7,8 and 10-14</u> is/are object	ted to.	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers	•	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted or b) objected to by the	ne Examiner.
	jection to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	• •
11) The proposed drawing correction file	d on is: a)□ approved b)□ d	isapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are re		
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim	n for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received in Ap	oplication No
	of the priority documents have been national Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) on for a list of the certified copies not a	-
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	or domestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign lar 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim f		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Page 1	PTO-948) 5) Notice of Ir	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)  Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
S. Patent and Trademark Office TO-326 (Rev. 04-01)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 15

Application/Control Number: 09/582,003

Art Unit: 1725

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Priority**

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Europe on 12-19-97. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a <u>certified</u> copy of the 97850179.9 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

On 7-22-03 the applicant faxed the Examiner copies of EP-0928659A1 and WO 99/32254. These are not <u>certified</u> copies of the priority document.

WIPO informed the Examiner that a certified copy of the priority document was not filed in the international phase. So, at this time the earliest priority date that the Examiner can assign to the case is 12-15-98 from PCT/SE98/02302.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsson (WO 97/48517) in view of Martin et al. (6,045,028). Larsson teaches a work-table (#7), clamping means (#5-6); and a welding unit comprising a friction stir head (#12); a milling unit (claim 1); the milling unit comprises a milling head that is separate from the friction stir welding head (claim 3); the milling unit is formed by the

Application/Control Number: 09/582,003

Art Unit: 1725

friction stir welding head (claim 2); the milling unit consists of milling head which is separate from the friction stir welding head and of a friction stir welding head fitted with a milling tool (page 4, lines 7-13; and claims 2-4);. Larsson does not teach that the welding unit comprises a friction stir welding head and a fusion welding head.

Martin et al. teaches tack welding a metal strip to the workpieces prior to friction stir welding (Figures 4A-4B; column 2, lines 15-17 and column 5, lines 26-29). Tack welding in the welding art is done by fusion welding techniques such as GTAW, GMAW, RSW and LBW. Therefore, Martin et al. teaches using the processes of fusion welding and friction stir together on the same workpiece. Thus, it is obvious that the fusion welding means and friction stir welding means could have been integrated into one apparatus in order to eliminate an unnecessary step of moving the workpiece from the fusion welding apparatus to the friction stir welding apparatus. In an integrated apparatus the workpiece would not have to be moved from one welding machine to another, thus increasing the efficiency of the welding process.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the fusion welding means and the friction stir welding means of Martin et al. with the friction stir welding apparatus of Larsson in order to reduce the number of positioning steps required to fusion weld (tack weld) and friction stir weld a workpiece, which would increase the efficiency of the process as discussed above.

Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larsson (WO 97/48517) and Martin et al. (6,045,028) as applied to claim 1 above, and

Application/Control Number: 09/582,003

**Art Unit: 1725** 

further in view of Juengst et al. (5,484,315). Larsson and Martin do not teach a laser welding head, however, Martin does teach tack welding as discussed above and Larsson does teach a milling unit (claim 1). Juengst et al. teaches tack welding with a laser welding head (column 8, line 63-column 9, line 15). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the laser tack welding head of Juengst et al. with the tack welding of Martin and the friction stir welding apparatus of Larsson in order to form an integrated friction stir welding device with a laser tack welding head that would be capable of fusing the components together prior to the subsequent friction stir welding process.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-8 and 10-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record does not teach or suggest either alone or in combination a welding apparatus as recited by claims 7 and 10-14, particularly the work-table comprises at least one backing and each workpiece is clamped to the backing by means of the separate clamping means, wherein the backing consists of at least two parts which are arranged for relative movement to one another.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/582,003

Art Unit: 1725

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kiley Stoner whose telephone number is (703) 305-0723. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on Monday-Friday. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Kiley Stoner A.U. 1725

Wey How 7-22-03